



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/827,094	04/06/2001	Hiroyuki Miyake	205405US2	2190
22850	7590	06/05/2006	EXAMINER	
OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C. 1940 DUKE STREET ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			GIBBS, HEATHER D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2625	

DATE MAILED: 06/05/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/827,094	MIYAKE, HIROYUKI
Examiner	Art Unit	
Heather D. Gibbs	2625	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 December 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 04/06/01.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other: ____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendment filed on December 8, 2005 has been entered and made of record.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see Pages 2-7, filed December 8, 2005, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-8 under Saiga (JP 06095040) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Leberl et al (US 6,122,078).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

3. Claims 1,8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Leberl et al (IS 6,122,078).

Regarding claim 1, which is representative of claim 8, Leberl teaches a an image pickup device comprising: a first lens 1005 configured to transmit light that enters from a first direction; a second lens 1007 configured to transmit light that enters from a second

direction, which is different from said first direction; a photo receiving face 1001A-C configured to receive light passed through said first lens and light passed through said second lens; and a light shield plate 1015,1017 wherein said light shield plate prevents an interference between a first light flux that passes through said first lens and travels towards said photo receiving face and a second light flux that passes through said second lens and travels toward said photo receiving face so that said first and second light fluxes are not overlapped with each other on said photo receiving face (Fig 10A; Col 28 Lines 65-Col 29 Line 10).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 2-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leberl (US 6,122,078) in view of Matsumura et al (US 4,563,576).

For claim 2, Leberl disclose the image pickup device and method as discussed above.

Leberl does not disclose expressly a translucent member including a plate-shaped part which is almost parallel to said photo receiving face to protect said photo receiving face, wherein said translucent member is constructed by a plurality of translucent member pieces divided so as to be adapted to placement of said light

shielding plate, and said translucent member pieces are disposed so as to sandwich said light shield plate.

Matsumura discloses a translucent member (10,16) including a plate-shaped part which is almost parallel to said photo receiving face to protect said photo receiving face, wherein said translucent member is constructed by a plurality of translucent member pieces divided so as to be adapted to placement of said light shielding plate, and said translucent member pieces are disposed so as to sandwich said light shield plate (Fig 2).

Leberl & Matsumura are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, imaging devices.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine Matsumura with Leberl et al.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to abet in eliminating the need to place an extra light source in the optical system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Matsumura with Leberl to obtain the invention as specified in claim 2.

Considering claim 3, Matsumura teaches wherein said translucent member pieces and said light shield plate are formed integrally (Fig 2).

Considering claim 4, Matsumura teaches wherein each of said translucent member pieces comprises at least two side walls which extend from said plate-shaped part and are in contact with a photo receiving element including said photo receiving

face so as to maintain a constant distance between said plate-shaped part and said photo receiving face (Fig 2).

Regarding claim 5, Matsumura teaches wherein said side wall surround a space between said translucent member piece and said photo receiving face by a combination with said light shield plate (Fig 2).

Considering claim 6, Matsumura teaches means for changing a travel direction of at least one of light passed through said first lens and light passed through said second lens so that the light travels toward said photo receiving face (Col 4 Lines 9-10).

6. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Leberl et al (US 6,122,078) and further in view of Tsuchida (US 6,163,411).

Leberl disclose the image pickup device as discussed above.

Leberl do not disclose expressly a portable telephone including an image pickup device.

Tsuchida discloses a portable telephone including an image pickup device.

Leberl & Tsuchida are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include Tsuchida with Leberl.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been as all three systems involve a lens system and an image pickup apparatus.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Tsuchida with Leberl to obtain the invention as specified in claim 7.

Conclusion

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Heather D. Gibbs whose telephone number is 571-272-7404. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thu 8AM-7PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David K. Moore can be reached on 571-272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


Heather D Gibbs
Examiner
Art Unit 2625

hdg



THOMAS D. LEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER